NO: UWY-CV18-6046437 S SHERLACH, WILLIAM

: SUPERIOR COURT : JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

\* AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

JONES, ALEX, ET AL. : JUNE 18, 2019

NO: UWY-CV18-6046438 S : SUPERIOR COURT LAFFERTY, ERICA, ET AL.

: JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

: AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

JONES, ALEX EMRIC, ET AL. JUNE 18, 2019

NO: UWY-CV18-6046436 S : SUPERIOR COURT SHERLACH, WILLIAM, ET AL.

: JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

JONES, ALEX EMRIC, ET AL.

• JUNE 18, 2019

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BARBARA N. BELLIS, JUDGE EXCERPT

## APPEARANCES:

Representing the Plaintiffs:

ATTORNEY CHRISTOPHER MATTEI ATTORNEY WILLIAM BLOSS ATTORNEY JOSHUA KOSKOFF ATTORNEY MATTHEW BLUMENTHAL Koskoff, Koskoff & Bieder, PC 350 Fairfield Avenue

Bridgeport, CT 06604

Representing the Defendants Alex Jones; Infowars, LLC; Free Speech Systems, LLC; Infowars Health, LLC; and Prison Planet TV, LLC:

ATTORNEY ZACHARY REILAND ATTORNEY NORMAN PATTIS Pattis & Smith, LLC 383 Orange Street 1st Floor New Haven, CT 06511

Representing the Defendant Cory Sklanka: ATTORNEY KRISTAN JAKIELA Regnier, Taylor, Curran & Eddy 100 Pearl Street 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Hartford, CT 06103

Representing the Defendant Midas Resources, Inc.: ATTORNEY STEPHEN BROWN Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker 1010 Washington Boulevard Stamford, CT 06901

> Recorded By: Colleen Birney Transcribed By: Colleen Birney Court Recording Monitor 1061 Main Street Bridgeport, CT 06604

## (EXCERPT)

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to start with the discovery issues.

Putting aside the fact that the documents the Jones defendants did produce contained child pornography, putting aside the fact that the Jones defendants filed with the Court a purported affidavit from Alex Jones that was not in fact signed by Alex Jones, the discovery in this case has been marked with obfuscation and delay on the part of the defendants, who, despite several Court-ordered deadlines as recently as yesterday, they continue in their filings to object to having to, what they call affirmatively gather and produce documents which might help the plaintiffs make their case. Despite over approximately a dozen discovery status conferences and several Court-ordered discovery deadlines, the Jones defendants have still not fully and fairly complied with their discovery obligations.

By way of one example, on June 10<sup>th</sup>, counsel for the Jones defendants stated in their filing that Alex Jones' cellphone had only been searched for emails, not for text messages or other data. In their June 17 filing, defendants still try to argue with respect to the text messages that there is little to no personal nexus between the text messages and the litigation, and that the plaintiffs are simply prying

into the Alex Jones defendants' personal affairs.

But the discovery objections were ruled on by the

Court months ago and the defendants still have not

fully and fairly complied.

Also, as another example, the Google Analytics data was ordered to be produced. And this is a Google Analytics account that had to be created and set up by and utilized, according to the testimony, by some of the Jones defendants. Only a 35-page report was produced. In their June 17 filing, the Jones defendants apparently say that they don't possess the data themselves and they should not have to get it from Google because Google holds Alex Jones in contempt. And anything that Google generated would be, and I quote, inherently unreliable, unquote. And again, the Jones defendants miss the mark. They were ordered to produce that data.

Our rules of practice require a party to produce materials and information, quote, within their knowledge, possession, or power; and it is clearly within the power of the Jones defendants to obtain the information from Google if, as they claim, they don't possess it themselves. So their objection is too late and their failure to fully and fairly comply is inexcusable.

So in short, we've held approximately a dozen discovery status conferences. The Court's entered

discovery deadlines, extended discovery deadlines, and discovery deadlines have been disregarded by the Jones defendants, who continue to object to their discovery and failed to produce that which is within their knowledge, possession, or power to obtain. And again, among the documents that they did produce contained images of child pornography.

1.7

I also note that the Jones defendants have been on notice from this Court both on the record and in writing in written orders that the Court would consider denying them their opportunity to pursue a special motion to dismiss if the continued noncompliance continued.

Now with respect to the plaintiffs' request for immediate review and the Jones defendants' objections thereto, as I've said, I've reviewed the -- both broadcasts several times. The law is clear in Connecticut and elsewhere, for that matter, that the Court has authority to address out-of-court bad-faith litigation misconduct where there is a claim that a party harassed or threatened or sought to intimidate counsel on the other side. And indeed, the Court has the obligation to ensure the integrity of the judicial process and functioning of the Court.

So if Mr. Jones truly believed that Attorney Mattei or anyone else in the Koskoff firm planted child pornography trying to frame him, the proper

course of action would be to contact the authorities and/or to have your attorney file the appropriate motions in the existing case. Just by way as an example, the Jones defendants here could have filed a motion asking that the lawsuits be dismissed for that reason.

What is not appropriate, what is indefensible, unconscionable, despicable, and possibly criminal behavior is to accuse opposing counsel, through a broadcast, no less, of planting child pornography, which is a serious felony. And to continue with the accusations in a tirade or rant for approximately 20 minutes or so.

Now, because I want to make a good record for appeal, I'm going to refer to certain portions of the transcript of the website. And I would note that Mr. Jones refers to Attorney Mattei as a Democratic-appointed US attorney, holds up on the camera Attorney Mattei's Wikipedia page which indicates that he is a Democrat, and puts the camera on the website page, which looks like it's from the law firm.

Alex Jones states: what a nice group of

Democrats. How surprising, what nice people. Chris

Mattei, Chris Mattei. Let's zoom in on Chris Mattei.

Oh, nice, little Chris Mattei. What a good

American. What a good boy. You'll think you'll put

me on.

1.4

2.2

Now, the transcript doesn't reflect this, but

when I listened to the broadcast, I heard, I'm going

to kill. Now, that's not in the transcript, but that

is my read and understanding and what I heard in the

broadcast.

He continues to say: anyways, I'm done. Total war. You want it, you got it. I'm not into kids like your Democratic Party, you cocksuckers, so get ready.

And during this particular tirade, he slammed his hand on Attorney Mattei's picture, which was on the camera at that point.

He continues on shortly thereafter: the point is, I'm not putting up with these guys anymore, man, and their behavior because I'm not an idiot. They literally went right in there and found this hidden stuff. Oh, my god, oh, my god, and they're my friends. We want to protect you now, Alex. Oh, you're not going to get into trouble for what we found. F you, man, F you to hell. I pray God, not anybody else, God visit vengeance upon you in the name of Jesus Christ and all the saints. I pray for divine intervention against the powers of Satan.

I literally would never have sex with children.

I don't like having sex with children. I would

never have sex with children. I am not a Democrat.

I am not a Liberal. I do not cut children's genitals

off like the left does.

Further on, referring to the person who sent the child porn, he says: I wonder who the person of interest is. Continues to say: oh, no. Attorney Pattis says: look, are you showing Chris Mattei's photograph on here; and the record should reflect that when Alex Jones said I wonder who the person of interest is, Attorney Mattei's photo was on the camera. Again, referring to who planted the child pornography. Then Alex Jones says: oh, no, that was an accidental cut. He's a nice Obama boy. He's a good -- then Attorney Pattis cuts him off. Attorney -- Alex Jones goes on to say: he's a white Jew-boy that thinks he owns America.

Later on in the broadcast, Alex Jones says, quote, the bounty is out, bitches. And you know your feds, they're going to know you did it. They're going to get your ass you little dirt bag. One million, bitch, it's out on your ass.

Shortly thereafter, he says: a million dollars is after them. So I bet you'll sleep real good tonight, little jerk, because your own buddies are going to turn you in and you're going to go to prison, you little white Jew-boy jerk-off son of a bitch. I mean, I can't handle them. They want more, they're going to get more. I am sick of these people, a bunch of chicken-craps that have taken this

country over that want to attack real Americans.

And those are just portions of the transcript that the Court relied on. The Court has no doubt that Alex Jones was accusing Plaintiffs' Counsel of planting the child pornography.

Again, these are just a few examples where Jones either directly harasses or intimidates Attorney

Mattei, repeatedly accuses Plaintiffs' Counsel of requesting the metadata so they could plant the child pornography, continues to call him a bitch, a sweet little cupcake, a sack of filth, tells him to go to hell, and the rant or tirade continues with frequent declarations of war against Plaintiffs' Counsel.

I reject the Jones defendants' claim that Alex Jones was enraged. I disagree with Attorney Pattis's representation here. I find based upon a review of the broadcast clips that it was an intentional, calculated act of rage for his viewing audience. So — and I note as Plaintiffs' Counsel pointed out, that Alex Jones was the one who publically brought the existence of the child pornography to light on his Infowars show.

But putting that aside, putting aside whether it was -- he was in a real rage or whether he was acting out rage, it doesn't really matter for the purposes of the discussion whether he was truly enraged or not, because the 20-minute deliberate tirade and

\* 2

harassment and intimidation against Attorney Mattei and his firm is unacceptable and sanctionable. And the Court will sanction here.

So for all these reasons, the Court is denying the Alex Jones defendants the opportunity to pursue their special motions to dismiss and will award attorney's fees upon further hearing and the filing of affidavits regarding attorney's fees. I would note that the attorney's fees will be related only to the conduct relating to the child pornography issue and not for the discovery failures.

At this point, I decline to default the Alex
Jones defendants, but I will — I don't know how
clearly I can say this. As this case progresses, and
we will get today before you leave a trial date in
the case now and a scheduling order. As the
discovery in this case progresses, if there is
continued obfuscation and delay and tactics like I've
seen up to this point, I will not hesitate after a
hearing and an opportunity to be heard to default the
Alex Jones defendants if they from this point forward
continue with their behavior with respect to
discovery.

So I'm going to call other matters now. I'm going to ask that you -- that there not be any conversations in the courtroom because I do have other matters to call. I'm going to ask Counsel to

work on a scheduling order, pick a trial date. I am going to need to see it before you leave. So if you could maybe do that in another room, and then I'll come back on the record for that. \*\*\*\*\* (END OF EXCERPT) THE HONORABLE BARBARA N. BELLIS, JUDGE 

NO: UWY-CV18-6046437 S : SUPERIOR COURT SHERLACH, WILLIAM : JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

v. AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

JONES, ALEX, ET AL. : JUNE 18, 2019

NO: UWY-CV18-6046438 S : SUPERIOR COURT LAFFERTY, ERICA, ET AL. : JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

: AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

JONES, ALEX EMRIC, ET AL. : JUNE 18, 2019

NO: UWY-CV18-6046436 S : SUPERIOR COURT SHERLACH, WILLIAM, ET AL. : JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OF FAIRFIELD

v. at bridgeport, connecticut

JONES, ALEX EMRIC, ET AL. JUNE 18, 2019

## CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above-referenced case, heard in Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield, at Bridgeport, Connecticut, before the Honorable Barbara N. Bellis, Judge, on the 18th day of June, 2019.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2019, in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Colleen Birney Court Recording Monitor